



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,435	12/31/2001	Gary R. Lister		4234
7590	03/11/2004		EXAMINER	
Gary R Lister 301 Hemlock Street Cultus Lake, BC V2R 4Y7 CANADA			DUONG, THANH P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/019,435	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LISTER, GARY R.
	<b>Examiner</b> Tom P Duong	<b>Art Unit</b> 1764

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: as stated in Final Rejection.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Note, facimile document dated on 2/17/04 is being treated as "Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116"

Examiner respectfully disagrees that applicant argued that the putter system of Pelz could not establish proper alignment. Pelz clearly shows a golfer can provide proper putter alignment (See Fig. 1) by positioning himself or herself so that the sighting line is aligned with index marks 42 and index mark 28. Pelz fails to show an index mark 28 being located in the center top of the putter head body. Both Condo '556 and Lucetti '851 teach that it is conventional to provide indicia 16 and groove 22, respectively, to assist a golfer to align the golf ball with the target (Condo '556, Abstract). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Condo and Lucetti to one having ordinary to modify the index mark of Pelz with indicia of Condo or groove of Lucetti to facilitate alignment of the putter head with the golf ball.

The argument with respect to alignment by eye sighting is not dependent from a golfer's stance and height is not persuasive. Pelz recognizes the importance of having a plurality of index markings 42 to accommodate different users' stances and heights. Therefore, Pelz clearly shows the importance of having a user sighting line is aligned with the index marks 42 and index mark 28. In addition, by providing different index markings 42 on the shaft of a putter, the putter of Pelz not only can provide proper alignment for a single user but also to multi-users.



Glenn Catarola  
Supervisor, Patent Examiner  
Technician, Patent Examiner